



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/024,432

12/18/2001

Harry Kargman

AVE-003RCE3

3451

959 7590 12/09/2008

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP  
FLOOR 30, SUITE 3000  
ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE  
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

RAMPURIA, SATISH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2191

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/09/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/024,432	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KARGMAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> SATISH RAMPURIA	<b>Art Unit</b> 2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 19-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 19-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

***Response to Amendment***

1. This action is in response to the amendment received on 11/06/2008.
2. Claims cancelled by the applicants: 16-18
3. Claims amended by the applicants: 1-8, 9-15, 19-23.
4. Claims added by the applicants: 24-26.
5. Claims pending in the application: 1-15, 19-26.

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

6. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/06/2008 has been entered.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2191

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-8, 19-21, 22, 25, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,848,415 to Guck (hereinafter called Guck) in view of US Patent No. 2002/0165988 to Khan (hereinafter called Khan).

**Per claim 1:**

Guck disclose:

- providing content in a generic markup language (col. 4, lines 25-27 “Any document... have "content" is stored... database as a resource object” and See FIG. 3 and related discussion), content in a generic markup language susceptible to being converted to a plurality languages capable of being displayed on a mobile device interfaced with network (col. 6, lines 11-14 “The network 40 has communication connections to the client 10, the client 20, the client 30 and the client 33, each of which involves different communication protocols”); and
- receiving a request for content from a mobile device interfaced with network (col. 4, lines 46-47 “database to set up a requested document in the format appropriate to the User-requester”);
- retrieving device information for the identified type of device from the at least one registry (col. 4, lines 39-50 “dynamically modify its characteristics to... formatting requirements requested by the User and/or formatting requirements required by the protocol being used... display... PDA... cellular phone”); and

Art Unit: 2191

- converting the content in the generic markup language into a form of content displayable on the mobile device (col. 4, lines 40-42 “A document... dynamically converted into a wide range of formats”),
- customizing the converted content based upon at least one device attribute in the device information retrieved from the at least one registry the customizing occurring programmatically without input from a user (col. 4, lines 63-65 “The dynamic conversion technique works equally well for conversion from one resource type to another and/or from one content format to another” and See FIG. 7 and related discussion).

Although, Guck teach provide the content converter to any device. Guck is silent on providing the registry information for the device. However, this feature deemed to be inherent to the Guck system, Guck system shows converting the content for any device in any format, col. 4, lines 33-39. Guck system would in inoperative if the converted format is not compatible with client device.

Guck does not explicitly disclose identifying automatically without user input, based on the request, a type of device for the mobile device; transmitting the generated content over the network to the mobile device.

However, Khan discloses in an analogous computer system identifying automatically without user input, based on the request, a type of device for the mobile device (paragraph [0008]); transmitting the generated content over the network to the mobile device (paragraph [0011]).

Art Unit: 2191

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of identifying automatically without user input, based on the request, a type of device for the mobile device; transmitting the generated content over the network to the mobile device as taught by Khan into the method of converting the text the for the target device as taught by Guck. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to identifying automatically without user input, based on the request, a type of device for the mobile device; transmitting the generated content over the network to the mobile device to provide a flexible display for a specific device as suggested by Khan (paragraph [0005]).

**Per claims 2 and 3:**

Guck disclose:

- translating the content from an original programming language into generic markup language prior to converting the content in the generic markup language into content displayable on the mobile device (col. 4, lines 55-58 “if the document... requested... is not immediately transferable, the server automatically... utilizes a converter object which transforms the document's content to a format compatible with the request”).

**Per claim 4 :**

Guck disclose:

- providing a translator capable of converting HTML content into generic markup language content; and translating HTML formatted content into generic markup

Art Unit: 2191

language content using HTML translator (col. 4, lines 67 “converter could convert a plain text file to an HTML file”, also, fig. 3, and related discussion).

**Per claims 5 and 6:**

Guck disclose:

- marking the generic markup language the content with identifiers (col. 8, line 24 “a message document will be assigned a unique “message id””); and
- performing the retrieving of device information from at least one registry based on one of identifiers marking the content (col. 8, lines 27-30 “The Resource object created on behalf of the document is assigned "properties" that represent the document's content and identity”).

**Per claims 7 and 8:**

Guck disclose:

- providing a set of rules for translating of content from generic markup language into device-specific content displayable on the mobile device (col. 4, lines 37-38 “dynamically modify its characteristics to accommodate formatting requirements requested by the User”); and
- applying at least one rule from the set of rules in combination with the device information from the at least one registry to generate content for the mobile device; (col. 4, lines 39-40 “formatting requirements required by the protocol being used”).

Art Unit: 2191

**Per claim 19 and 20:**

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Guck does not explicitly disclose wherein wireless device is a cellular phone, wherein the mobile device is a PDA.

However, Khan discloses in an analogous computer system wherein the mobile device is a cellular phone (paragraph [0009]).

The feature of using devices such as cellular phone would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

*Claims 21 and 22* are the computer program product claim corresponding to method claims 1 and 8 respectively, and rejected under the same rationale set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1 and 8 respectively, above.

*Claims 25 and 26* are the computer program product claim corresponding to method claims 1 and 19 respectively, and rejected under the same rationale set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1 and 19 respectively, above.

10. Claims 9, 10-15, 23, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck in view of Khan and further in view of US Patent No. 6,857,102 to Bickmore (hereinafter called Bickmore).

**Per claim 9:**



Art Unit: 2191

The rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and further, neither Guck nor Khan explicitly disclose wherein the at least one user preference is at least one of user interface choices, key mappings, key behavior, functionality, amount of information to be rendered, language, and location.

However, Bickmore discloses in an analogous computer system the at least one user preference is at least one of user interface choices, key mappings, key behavior, functionality, amount of information to be rendered, language, and location (col. 2, lines 41-65 “In client-side navigation, the user is given the ability to interactively navigate within a single web page by altering the portion of the single web page that is displayed at any given time...” it would be obvious to have user choice interface and its functionality).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of at least one user preference is at least one of user interface choices, key mappings, key behavior, functionality, amount of information to be rendered, language, and location as taught by Bickmore into the method of converting the text the for the target device as taught by the combination system of Guck and Khan. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have user preferences of users’ choice to not to provide display restrictions by the server to each device as suggested by Bickmore (col. 3, lines 20-30).

**Per claims 10-12:**

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, neither Guck nor Khan explicitly disclose providing a plurality of stylesheets for the generic markup language; using the stylesheets in generating the content for the mobile device.

Art Unit: 2191

However, Bickmore discloses in an analogous computer system providing a plurality of stylesheets for the generic markup language; using the stylesheets in generating the content for the mobile device (col. 2, lines 25-40 "...A series of style sheets may be attached to a document, each with a weight describing that style sheet's desirability to the document's author. The user can also specify a default style sheet. The browser used by the user to access the distributed network can also define a "default" style sheet...").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of using stylesheets to convert the content for the desired device as taught by Bickmore into the method of converting the text the for the target device as taught by the combination system of Guck and Khan. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use the stylesheets to convert the content to desired devices to provide a better display on handheld devices without losing it visibility as suggested by Bickmore (col. 1, lines 10-16).

**Per claim 13:**

The rejection of claim 10 is incorporated, and further, neither Guck nor Khan explicitly disclose wherein at least one of the stylesheets converts the generic markup language content into HDML content.

However, Bickmore discloses in an analogous computer system wherein at least one of stylesheets converts generic markup language content into HDML content (col. 2, lines 5-12 "Information... be provided from the distributed network at large, but the desired pages must be pre-defined, and custom information extraction and page formatting software must be written to

Art Unit: 2191

deliver the information to the small device. This is the approach taken in Unwired Planet's UP.Link service, which uses a proprietary mark-up language (HDML)").

The feature of using stylesheet to convert content into HDML content would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 10.

**Per claim 14:**

The rejection of claim 10 is incorporated, and further, neither Guck nor Khan explicitly disclose wherein at least one of the stylesheets converts the generic markup language content into i-mode content.

However, Bickmore discloses in an analogous computer system wherein at least one of stylesheets converts generic markup language content into i-mode content (col. 24, lines 19-28 "The document filtering systems... to extract... information from a document based on commands written by a user in a high-level scripting language... combine page structure navigation, regular expression matching, site traversal, i.e., web crawling, and iterative matching, in addition to re-authoring of the extracted information using the document re-authoring systems and methods...").

The feature of converting the content into the i-mode content would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 10.

**Per claim 15:**

Art Unit: 2191

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, neither Guck nor Khan explicitly disclose wherein the amount of the content generated that is delivered to the user mobile device is based on the display capacity of the mobile device.

However, Bickmore discloses in an analogous computer system the amount of device-specific content that is delivered to user is based on the display capacity of mobile device (col. 4, lines 65-67 to col. 5, lines 1-5 "...automatic document re-authoring capability coupled with document filtering to provide access to arbitrary documents on a distributed network, such as the Internet or an intranet, to devices with limited communications bandwidth and small displays").

The feature of displaying the content within the capacity of the device would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

**Per claim 23:**

The rejection of claim 21 is incorporated and further, Neither Guck nor Khan explicitly disclose the at least one device attribute including at least one attribute from the group of a color depth attribute, memory attribute, storage capacity attribute and operating system of the mobile device attribute.

However, Bickmore discloses in an analogous computer system the at least one device attribute including at least one attribute from the group of a color depth attribute, memory attribute, storage capacity attribute and operating system of the mobile device attribute (col. 3, lines 65-67 "automatically transform a document into a plurality of linked subdocuments, where each subdocument requires less display area (color attribute)" and col. 4, lines 22-23 "a

Art Unit: 2191

document to extract a described portion based on a predefined script”). Further, Bickmore system performs document transformation suitable to display for a device type.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of at least one device attribute including at least one attribute from the group of a color depth attribute, memory attribute, storage capacity attribute and operating system of the mobile device attribute as taught by Bickmore into the method of converting the text the for the target device as taught by Guck. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have at least one device attribute including at least one attribute from the group of a color depth attribute, memory attribute, storage capacity attribute and operating system of the mobile device attribute to provide automatically re-author documents designed for a larger display area for display on a smaller display area as suggested by Bickmore (col. 3, lines 61-63).

*Claims 24* are the computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 23 and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 23, above.

### ***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Satish S. Rampuria** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3732**.

Art Unit: 2191

The examiner can normally be reached on **8:30 am to 5:00 pm** Monday to Friday except every other Friday and federal holidays. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Wei Y. Zhen** can be reached on **(571) 272-3708**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/SATISH RAMPURIA/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2191